

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/963,480	09/27/2001	Kaoru Awaka	TI-33253 (032350.B345)	8718
_ -	7590 06/05/200 RUMENTS INCORPO	EXAMINER		
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999			DO, CHAT C	
DALLAS, TX 75265			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2193	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/05/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@ti.com uspto@dlemail.itg.ti.com

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/963,480	AWAKA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Chat C. Do	2193	

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 15 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on ____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). **AMENDMENTS** 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below): (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or · (d) [] They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) uill not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: 3 and 12. Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,10,19 and 20</u>. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____. AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12.
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

Chat C. Do Examiner Art Unit: 2193 Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues in pages 9-10 for independent claims that the cited reference by Hansen et al. neither teach a transistor difference in width of nor cells differing in anyway. The examiner respectfully submits that the claims do not specifically disclose or require a specific amount of differing in width of transistor. The transistors are manufactured with slightly differing in width as expected. Thus, the limitation is expectedly met by the cited reference Hansen et al. since the claims do not specific how much differ in width of transistor is needed between the transistors. The applicant also argues in pages 10-11 for independent claims that the cited references by Hansen et al. and Itoh fail to disclose the critical paths and the construction of cells with differing transistor widths for differing locations within the circuit.

The examiner respectfully submits that the critical path is existed in every circuit as the latest path (e.g. in term of time/cycle) to generate output from input. As clearly addressed in the rejection, the primary reference by Hansen et al. fail to disclose the first Booth decoder cell as transistor has a width larger than the width of transistor of the second Booth decoder cell. However, the secondary reference by Itoh explicitly discloses the intended use and benefit of having a larger width in transistor in order to increase the speed of processing. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to make transistors along the critical path with larger width in order to improve the processing time.